



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,806	07/14/2003	Mark Roby	2910	5794

7590 03/20/2007
TYCO HEALTHCARE GROUP LP
150 GLOVER AVENUE
NORWALK, CT 06856

EXAMINER

RICCI, JOHN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3711

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	03/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/618,806
Filing Date: July 14, 2003
Appellant(s): ROBY ET AL.

MAILED
MAR 20 2007
GROUP 3700

Dana A. Brussel
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Application/Control Number:
10/618,806
Art Unit: 3711

Page 2

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 5, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed April 5, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

Application/Control Number:
10/618,806
Art Unit: 3711

Page 3

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

(1) U.S. Patent 5,733,293 to Scirica et al., issued March 31, 1998;

(2) U.S. Patent 4,928,830 to Brewer, issued May 29, 1990.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scirica 5,733,293 in view of Brewer 4,928,830.

Scirica shows a package for a needle and Suture (figure 3A), including a base portion 66, cover 68, a needle park, a rail 74 defining a suture race 70, and an aperture 72 for passage of the suture. The cover is retained by tabs 76, and is completely removable; this has the disadvantage that the cover may be lost or misplaced. One would recognize that it would be desirable to attach the cover to the base so the cover cannot be lost. For example, Brewer shows that a container for medical equipment may have a base 22, and a cover 24 attached to the base by means of a living hinge 26 (figure 2). This would be desirable in the suture package of Scirica to prevent the cover from being lost. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to attach the base and cover of Scirica by a living hinge, as suggested by Brewer.

(10) Response to Argument

Applicant suggests that the package shown by Scirica would only be used once, then discarded; there would be no motivation to include a hinged cover such as shown by Brewer, because the package of Scirica would not be repeatedly opened and closed. However, there does not appear to be any feature of the device of Scirica, that would preclude repeated use; it would be possible to re-use the container after cleaning. Even if the container were to be used only once, using a hinged cover would be desirable to keep the components together during storage and processing. The container of Brewer is in the same field of medical and surgical equipment, and would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that a suture container would benefit from the hinged cover.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Application/Control Number:
10/618,806
Art Unit: 3711

Page 6

For the above reasons, it is believed that the
rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

John A. Ricci

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3711

John A. Ricci

Conferees:

Eugene Kim

Eugene Kim

Boyer Ashley

Boyer Ashley